

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE COU09 P-301 5021 Neil G. Cousins 10/701,184 11/04/2003 **EXAMINER** 277 07/27/2004 PRICE HENEVELD COOPER DEWITT & LITTON, LLP TRUONG, THANH K 695 KENMOOR, S.E. PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT P O BOX 2567 GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501 3721

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$\mathcal{A}$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	9-
	10/701,184	COUSINS ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	1
	Thanh K Truong	3721	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a sply within the statutory minimum of third will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI ate, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  ty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communic  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	cation.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04</u>	November 2003.		
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Th	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	•	• •	ts is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.E	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement		
,= ,,	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	•	<b>.</b>	
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 November 2003</u> is	·	•	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •	2474)
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	•		
	Examiner. Note the attached	JOHNES ACTION OF TOTAL TO 102	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documer</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documer</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea</li> </ul>	nts have been received. nts have been received in A ority documents have been	pplication No	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received.	
Attachment(s)  )   Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  )   Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s 3) 5) Notice of li	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) [ Other:	<del></del> ·	

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Drawings**

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference character(s) mentioned in the description: "a rack and pinion system 55" (page 3, [0014], line 1). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: [0014] lines 2-3, "from an open position as shown in Fig. 5 to a closed position as shown in Fig. 6" should be changed to -- from an open position as shown in Fig. 6 to a closed position as shown in Fig. 5 --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/701,184 Page 3

Art Unit: 3721

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kaufman (4,216,640).

Kaufman discloses (figures 1-7) a wrapping machine comprising:

a base 12;

a table 14 rotatably mounted to the base for powered rotation relative to the

base;

a wrapping device 18 adapted to feed film for wrapping items on the table;

a gripping device 86 on the table having an actuator 88A-B coupled to a gripping

member 22A-B.

Kaufman discloses the claimed invention, but does not expressly disclose that an electrically powered actuator moves the gripping device. Using electrically powered

actuator instead of pneumatic powered actuator is well known practice in the art, since it

is well known and within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known design

configuration on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as matter of obvious

design choice. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to modify Kaufman gripping device by

Application/Control Number: 10/701,184 Page 4

Art Unit: 3721

using an electrically powered actuator providing a simpler system and required less maintenance.

Kaufman further discloses: the actuator includes a linearly movable member 90A-B and resilient member that transmits force from the linear actuator 88A-B to the gripping member; the movable gripping member rotates upon movement of the linearly movable member; the gripping device includes a rack 90A-B and pinion 92A-B that rotates the first and second gripping members; and the first and second gripping members have gears that mesh with one another such that the first and second gripping member rotated in the opposite direction.

Regarding to claim 19, Kaufman discloses the claimed invention except that the rack includes an extension, first and second spaced apart stops, and the spring positioned between the extension and the stops. Since the examiner takes Official Notice of the equivalence of the gripping assembly disclosed by Kaufman and the gripping assembly in the present claimed invention for their use in the art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to retain and release film web from the wrapping device would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

5. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaufman (4,216,640) in view of Benhanou et al. (5,452,566).

As discussed above in the paragraph 4 of this office action, Kaufman discloses the claimed invention, except for the support arm retates around the wrapping area.

The Applicant's disclosure admitted that the wrapping apparatus as discloses in figures 1 and 8 are conventional and well known to those skilled in the art (page 3, lines 5-6), and the apparatus of figure 1 (the wrapping device with web dispenser rotates around the article to be wrapped) and figure 8 (the article to be wrapped is rotated while the web dispenser is stationary) are the obvious variation of the same invention.

Benhamou discloses a wrapping machine comprising: among other things a support arm 5 rotary mounted to the frame and supporting the wrapping device for movement about the wrapping area (figures 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to modify Kaufman's wrapping machine to include the support arm as taught by Benhamou providing a wrapping machine in which the article to be wrapped is stationary.

6. Claims 1, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benhamou et al. (5,452,566).

Benhamou discloses (figures 1-6) a wrapping machine comprising:

- a frame defining a wrapping area;
- a wrapping device 4 adapted to feed film web from a roll of film web;
- a support arm 5 rotatably mounted to the frame and supporting the wrapping device for movement about the wrapping are (figures 1-5);
- a gripping device 18 having a movable gripping member 19, 20 that selectively retain and release film web fed from the wrapping device.

a table 21 rotatably mounted to the base for powered rotation relative to the base; and a wrapping device 3 adapted to feed film for wrapping items 1 on the table (figure 6).

Benhamou discloses the claimed invention, but does not expressly disclose that an electrically powered actuator moves the gripping device. Using electrically powered actuator instead of pneumatic powered actuator is well known practice in the art, since it is well known and within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known design configuration on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as matter of obvious design choice. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to modify Benhamou gripping device by using an electrically powered actuator providing a simpler system and required less maintenance.

#### Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh K Truong whose telephone number is (703) 605-0423. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I Rada can be reached on (703) 308-2187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/701,184 Page 7

Art Unit: 3721

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tkt July 23, 2004.

EUGENE KIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Gove R